



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/573,385

05/07/2007

Tomoki Hamamoto

2006_0434A

9339

513

7590

09/17/2010

WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P.

1030 15th Street, N.W.,

Suite 400 East

Washington, DC 20005-1503

EXAMINER

EPPS -SMITH, JANET L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1633

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/17/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ddalecki@wenderoth.com

coa@wenderoth.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/573,385	Applicant(s) HAMAMOTO ET AL.	
	Examiner Janet L. Epps-Smith	Art Unit 1633	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 September 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,5,7,9 and 10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,5,7,9 and 10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 09/01/2010 has been entered.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7, and 9-10 are presently pending for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
5. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7, and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
6. Dependent claims 2, 4-5, 7, and 9-10 recite “A process.....” The use of the phrase “[A] process,” instead of “[T]he process..” renders the instant claims indefinite. The use of this phrase suggests that the process recited in these claims is independent from the process recited in claim 1.

Art Unit: 1633

7. Claim 1 recites wherein CMP-NeuAc has a purity of 95% or more, and claims 9-10 recite wherein a cation exchange method is require to substitution of the cationic moiety of the CMP-NeuAc. This suggests that the precipitated CMP-NeuAc is actually in the form of a salt with divalent cation. Thus the method appears to be incomplete since product appears to be in the form of a salt not a 95% pure acid as suggested by the method.

Response to Arguments

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The rejection of claim 1-2, 4-5 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Simon et al. (JACS, 1988, Vol. 110, pages 7159-7163, see IDS), is withdrawn in response to Applicant's amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. Claims 1-10 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simon et al. in view of Warren et al. and Vann et al.

10. Applicant's arguments filed 9/01/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants traversed the instant rejection on the grounds that one skilled in the art, such as Simon, would not expect that the simple precipitation method of the claimed invention could produce CMP-NeuAc that is 95% or more pure, without the use of purification steps such as chromatography. Applicant's own specification teaches that the method of Simon et al. does not require the use of chromatography, see page 4, 1st paragraph. Additionally, Applicants have not provided any evidence to support their assertion of unexpectedly high purity of CMP-NeuAc commensurate in scope with

Art Unit: 1633

the entire breadth of the claimed invention. As per MPEP § 716.01(c)[R-2]II. “[T]he arguments of counsel cannot take the place of evidence in the record. In re Schulze, 346 F.2d 600, 602, 145 USPQ 716, 718 (CCPA 1965). Examples of attorney statements which are not evidence and which must be supported by an appropriate affidavit or declaration include statements regarding unexpected results, commercial success, solution of a long-felt need, inoperability of the prior art, invention before the date of the reference, and allegations that the author(s) of the prior art derived the disclosed subject matter from the applicant.”

Absent evidence to the contrary, it would have been obvious to the ordinary skilled artisan at the time of the instant invention to modify the teachings of Simon et al. in view of Warren et al. and Vann et al. in the design of the instant invention. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification since the prior art clearly teaches that the enzyme that catalyzes the formation of CMP-NeuAc requires a divalent cation for activity, and further wherein the divalent cation includes manganese ion. Additionally, it would have been obvious to substitute one equivalent divalent cation (see that process of Simon et al. utilizes MgCl_2) for another (i.e. or Mn^{+2}) as taught by Vann et al., with the expectation of producing a similar result. See MPEP § 2144.06[R-6]II. SUBSTITUTING EQUIVALENTS KNOWN FOR THE SAME PURPOSE.

Furthermore, although the cited references do not teach the precise order of steps recited in the instant claims, as per MPEP § 2144.05 [R-5] “[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the

Art Unit: 1633

optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation.” In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Janet L. Epps-Smith whose telephone number is 571-272-0757. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 10:00 AM through 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Woitach can be reached on 571-272-0739. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Janet L. Epps-Smith/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1633